

**CCLAS sessions:** Multiple sessions from the Daisy corpus (subject B1) are discussed here

- Daisy's age is indicated in the title of the session, e.g. Session 01-Daisy-03\_08\_10 means Daisy is aged 03;08.10 at the time of that recording.
- All records in each session have been sorted by segment time (i.e., chronologically)
- Margaret and I watched chunks of video recordings, and then we went back through to discuss individual records.
- The focus here was on possessive inflection, primarily in Daisy's speech. For many forms, I overtly ask Margaret if she perceives/produces a final <h> because it's often hard for me to detect.

### **Session 01-Daisy-03\_08\_10**

#### **Record 581**

- Adult's utterance is *awâyiuh umâtiwâkinishiyuh* = 'Whose little toys?'
- Margaret says they usually say <awâyiuh umâtiwâkinishiyuh> 'Whose little toys?', so the adult has deleted the <ki> syllable
- *mâtiwâkin* [mæt'wagin]<sup>1</sup> = 'toy' (inanimate noun)
- *mâtiwâkinish* [mæt'waginʃ] = 'little toy'
- POSS form does not take the <im> suffix: \**nimâtiwâkinim* 'my little toy' (03:25)
- *awâyiuh umâtiwâkinishiyuh* [əwa'joh̥ ʊmætwəginʃ'joh̥] = 'whose little toys' (04:04)

#### **Record 582**

- Daisy's utterance: *awâshishh upîpîmishh* [əwaf<sup>h</sup> ubibipʃ] 'children, her little baby'
- Adult target: *awâshishh upîpîmishh* [ə'waf<sup>h</sup> ōbi'bimʃ<sup>h</sup>] (05:25)
- Margaret says both words are obviative and she hears Daisy producing the correct obviative forms. I'm not sure why 'children' would be obviated here, but 'her little baby' should be obviated because it's an animate third person possessed by a third person
- I'm not so sure that Daisy is actually saying the [əwaf<sup>h</sup>]. I think that may be coming from a child off-camera.
- *awâshishich* [ə'wafɪtʃ] = 'children'
- *nipîpîmish* [nəbi'bimʃ] = 'my little baby' (06:13)

---

### **Session 03-Daisy-03\_09\_22**

#### **Record 746**

- Daisy's utterance is <mâuyâ chipîpîmish â uyâ â kûtinimiwâu chipîpîmish> [mɔj'ædʒə'bibɪʃʌa.wimɔj'ædʒʊʔənɔdə'bibɪʃ<sup>h</sup>] 'This is for your baby, OK? Are you buying this for your baby?'
- The adult target is [ 'maɔja tʃə'bibimʃ a u'ja 'gʊtnəmaʊ tʃəbi'bimʃ] (00:09:33)

---

<sup>1</sup> Unless indicated otherwise, IPA forms in brackets following a word in Roman orthography indicate a phonetic transcription of the adult-like target. These can be used for comparison against Daisy's production.

- The [tʃə] is extremely reduced. I'm not sure of the accent placement on the verb.
- The particle *â* is questioning the element immediately preceding it: 'This (here)' and then 'this'
- No obviation on 'your little baby', so the obviative forms *mâuyâ* and *uyâ* are referring to the thing that is for the baby.
- *chipîpîmish* [tʃəbi'biɱʃ] 'your little baby' (00:10:13)

#### Record 764

- Daisy's utterance is *nimushum* ['nɒɱʃɒɱ] = 'my grandfather'
- Adult target is ['nɒɱʃɒɱ] (00:11:34)
- *chimushum* ['tʃɒɱʃɒɱ] = 'your grandfather' (00:11:40)
- *umushumh* [ɒɱ'ʃɒɱ<sup>h</sup>] = 'her grandfather'. This takes an OBV ending because it's a third person possessed by a third person. I clearly hear the obviative ending on this form, and I think I can perceive the accent on the final syllable, because it sounds a bit like the pitch is rising. (00:11:48)

#### Record 765

- Daisy's utterance is *âi mâuyâ uhkumh* [ajmawijaw<sup>u</sup>ɒɱ] 'this is her grandma's'
- Adult target is [aj 'maɒja ɒ'kɒɱ<sup>h</sup>] (00:12:59)
- Margaret says she hears Daisy correctly produce the obviative ending on 'her grandma's'. Margaret also says there is no final <h> pronounced on *mâuyâ*. This clearly indicates that *mâuyâ* is referring to an inanimate singular referent, which is possessed by 'her grandma'.
- For comparison: *mâuyâh uhkumh* [maɒ'ja<sup>h</sup> ɒ'kɒɱ<sup>h</sup>] = 'this is her grandma' (00:13:59). Both words are obviated, because *mâuyâh* and *uhkumh* are coreferenced. *Mâuyâh* is the form for the animate obviative.
- *uhkumh* [ɒ'kɒɱ<sup>h</sup>] 'her grandma' (00:13:06). It's hard for me to hear the final aspiration indicating OBV form.
- *nûhkum* ['nɒkɒɱ] 'my grandma'. (00:13:14) I hear the [h] before the second syllable pretty clearly on these productions. Maybe that's easier to perceive because the accent is on the first syllable?
- *mâu nûhkumh* = 'this is my grandma'. No obviation in play, because the possessor is first-person (00:17:01)
- Margaret confirms that some young people say *nikûhkum*, which indicates they're putting the first-person possessor prefix onto the lexicalized form *kûhkum*. She says this is the incorrect way to say 'my grandma'. That's because a person is literally saying 'my your grandma' (00:17:22)
- This record is interesting because it is an equational construction, so that means we cannot look to a verb form to track obviation in this construction.
- *mâuyâ uhkumh uminihkwâkinyiu* ['maɒja ɒ'kɒɱ<sup>h</sup> ɒmɪni'kwagɪɲjo<sup>h</sup>] = 'This is her grandma's cup' (*minihkwâkin* is inanimate) (00:14:36). I'm not sure if I placed the accent properly on [ɒmɪni'kwagɪɲjo<sup>h</sup>]. We have two referents getting obviated here: her grandma and the cup possessed by her grandma. The noun *uminihkwâkinyiu* '(her) cup' is marked with the inanimate singular obviative suffix *-iyiu*.

- In that example, *mâuyâ* occurs with its referent *uminihkwâkinyiu*. I wonder, though, if this is the kind of situation where the further obviative on ‘her cup’ may be called for because the possessor ‘her grandma’ is obviative. Perhaps *uminihkwâkinyiu* does not receive a further obviative marking because it is inanimate.

### Record 766

- Daisy’s utterance is < *âi an anitih an anitih kâ ashtâyich aniyâ châkwâyiu* > [ajənɪtʰənɪtʰgʌʃdʌjʃɪnjetəgʌja] ‘That one there, that one there, that thing sitting there’
- Margaret says this utterance sounds a little funny. Daisy could say instead *âi an anitih an anitih aniyâ kâ ashtâyich châkwâyiu* [aj ən ɪntʰ ən ɪntʰ ɛnja kaʃtajt tsagwajo], where the adverbial is moved to before the verb (00:19:41).
- In this record, *aniyâ châkwâyiu* is a construction where the demonstrative serves as an adnominal modifier and both words agree with inanimate singular obviative marking.
- This record has interesting dynamics for obviation. Presumably all three demonstratives (*an*, *an*, and *aniyâ*) are co-referencing the same inanimate singular referent. However, there is a mismatch in proximate/obviative status between *an* and *aniyâ châkwâyiu*. I wonder if this is a child error to produce such a mismatch, or if there is some discourse factor conditioning this. Is Daisy switching to OBV to foreground the ‘thing’?
- My hypothesis is that obviating might sometimes be used for foregrounding in NEC: Donna Starks says conjunct verb is used for foregrounding in Woods Cree

## Session 04-Daisy-03\_11\_11

### Record 239

- Daisy’s utterance is < *nâstâpwâh miywâshiuih uchâkwânimishh* > [əmjasiʃʊtutəkənɪmʃ] ‘Her little things (clothes) are very nice’
- I forgot to get the adult target for the entire utterance.
- Daisy is saying *châkwân* ‘thing’ instead of ‘clothes’. ‘clothes’ is an inanimate noun, and so is *châkwân*.
- *uchâkwânimishh* [ʊdzagwa'ɪnmʃʰ] = ‘her little things (clothes)’ (00:23:11)
- *nichâkwânimishh* [ɲdzagwa'ɪnmʃʰ] = ‘my little things (clothes)’ (00:23:39). There is a final <h> on this word too, but it’s not obviative. Instead, it’s the inanimate plural proximate suffix, which is homophonous with the inanimate plural OBV suffix.
- Daisy is looking at a book, so we cannot see what <*châkwân*> is referring to.
- Margaret heard Daisy produce a final [h] on ‘her things’. This is an important suffix, given the verbal inflection: The verbal inflection indicates that Daisy is using an inanimate plural obviative subject. So there is correct agreement there. This may indicate that Daisy has productively navigated the homophony involved with final <h>. That is, four grammatically distinct categories share this suffix: 1) animate singular obviative, 2) animate plural obviative, 3) inanimate plural proximate, and 4) inanimate plural obviative.

### Record 338

- Daisy's utterance is <nuwich miyushishiu my cake châtâyich> [dʒɪmjəfajke:tʒəjbajʃh] 'She will say "my cake is very nice"'
- Margaret says Daisy correctly produces the final [h] on *châtâyichh* [tʃaj'dajʃh] (00:25:45)
- In terms of obviation, this seems to be a pretty sophisticated construction. If the verb is ending with the suffixes <âyich>, then that's the 4>5 ending (an animate obviative acting upon an animate further obviative). This makes sense, because there are three third-person elements in play: Ani's grandma, Ani's grandma's cake, and the person Ani's grandma will be addressing. I suppose that Ani's grandmother is necessarily obviated because she is possessed by Ani. That gives us the 4 element for the verb. Then the person Ani's grandma is addressing is a third-person to Daisy and therefore gets marked as further obviative. In fact, as Margaret indicates, the verb's inflection "means she's going to say it to somebody else" (00:26:14).
- The adjectival verb agreeing with 'my cake' is not obviated, because the possessor is the speaker who is saying 'my cake'

### Record 339

- Daisy says *aniyâh ucakeimiyuh* 'That's her cake' (meaning Ani's grandma's cake, not Ani's cake)
- Margaret provides an adult target for *aniyâh ucakeimiyuh* [ɛn'jaʰ ʊkejgəm'joʰ] (00:30:23)
- For comparison: *aniyâh Ani ucakeimh* [ɛn'jaʰ ani ʊkej'gəmʰ] = 'That's Ani's cake' (00:28:36). Here the translation is equational, but I think it's actually the demonstrative serving as an adnominal (00:31:57). There is a hint of this in the way Margaret spontaneously translates *aniyâh Ani ucakeimh* as 'That Ani's cake' at 00:34:17.
- This record is really interesting. The *-iyuh* ending on *ucakeimiyuh* initially made it difficult for Margaret to translate. Following several minutes of discussion between Margaret and me, and from listening to the records more than once, it becomes clear that Ani is talking about her grandma's cake. At first, I thought Daisy committed an error of commission, where she produced the wrong suffix on 'her cake'. But that was not the case, and it seems she correctly produced a further obviative suffix *-iyuh*. I can't find much discussion of the further obviative on *eastcree.org*, but maybe I'm just missing it.

Forms for comparison, to show the emergence of the further obviative suffix:

- *âihkunâu* = 'cake' (animate noun)
- *utâihkunâmh* [udaɪkə'namʰ] = 'her cake', without the English loanword "cake" (00:35:01)
- *Ani utâihkunâmh* [ani udaɪkə'namʰ] = 'Ani's cake' (00:36:04)
- *Ani chîh muwimâu utâihkunâmh* ['æni tʃi 'maʊ ɔdaɪkə'namʰ] = 'Ani ate her cake' (it's Ani's cake) (00:39:39). Verb stem is VTA <muwiwâu>.
- *Marguerite chîh muwimâu Anih utâihkunâmiyuh* ['maɪgəɹɪt tʃi 'mɔwmaʊ 'æniʰ udaɪkənəm'joʰ] = 'Marguerite ate Ani's cake' (00:37:47). Here the further obviative marking occurs on 'her cake', because it is possessed by the obviative possessor Ani.
- *Ani uhkumh utâihkunâmiyuh* ['æni ʊh'kʊmʰ ɔdaɪkənəm'joʰ] = 'Ani's grandma's cake' (00:46:57)
- *ucakeimh* [ʊkej'gəmʰ] = 'her cake', with English loanword (00:35:46)

- *Ani ucakeimh* ['æni ōkej'gəm<sup>h</sup>] = 'Ani's cake' (00:36:32)
- *aniyâh ucakeimh* = 'that's her cake' (meaning Ani's cake). Again, I think the DEM is actually adnominal rather than creating an equational construction.
- *ucakeimiuiuh* = 'his/her cake', but it's got the further obviative suffix
- *Anih ucakeimiuiuh* = 'Ani's (OBV) cake (FURT.OBV)' (00:37:02)
- *aniyâh Anih ucakeimiuiuh* [ɛn'ja<sup>h</sup> ani<sup>h</sup> ōkejgəm'jo<sup>h</sup>] = 'That's Ani's cake' (00:32:47). I think this is an example where Ani is already obviated, and then she also possesses a cake, which then is marked as further obviative. So it ends up getting the same translation as *aniyâh Ani ucakeimh*, because the English translation does not necessarily reflect a proximate/obviative distinction.

## Record 402

- Daisy's utterance is *âi anitâh châpâtâwich nihomeworkimiui* [aj indaj aj ində indəhow ʃʌbədawgɪn həmaɪkəmijo] 'Ah ... I will bring my homework there'
- That orthography represents the adult-like target, according to Margaret. But Margaret says Daisy actually pronounces the verb as *châpâtâwik*, substituting a [k] for the word-final [ʃ] (00:48:28). She says this is a pronunciation that many young people are now producing.
- *nihomeworkim* [nəhom'wəkəm] = 'my homework' (00:49:48). So the English loanword "homework" takes the possessive suffix *-im*. There is no obviative inflection, as expected, because "homework" is a third-person entity possessed by a first-person entity.
- This record is really interesting because Daisy is adding the singular inanimate obviative suffix *-yiu* to a noun possessed by a first-person. I think this is a grammatical mistake, an error of commission. However, Margaret says this obviative ending on the noun is not a mistake (00:51:28) ... but it kind of seems as if she's not entirely sure. I think the issue is that Daisy produces an AI+O verb with a relational ending: *châpâtâwich*.
- "Relational" is an Algonquian-specific term, but it essentially means that the verb is encoded with a morpheme that adds an argument to the construction, and crucially, this additional argument must be an animate third person (Junker, 2003)<sup>2</sup>. I think this is leading to the error where Daisy puts a suffix that can only occur with third persons onto a noun possessed by a first person.
- One key to this puzzle is the fact that that Margaret says this construction works: *anitâh châpâtâyân nihomeworkim* [ɛn'dah ʃʌbədayan n̄hom'wəkəm] = 'I will bring my homework there' (00:52:18; 00:53:18). Here the verb does **not have a relational ending**, and the possessed noun does not have an obviative ending. Margaret says this version is even better, with the adverb moved after the verb: *châpâtâyân anitâh nihomeworkim*
- In summary, I think Daisy's production of *-yiu* is actually an error of commission with one of two explanations: 1) Daisy means to say 'his homework', and so she is producing the obviative suffix correctly but producing the **wrong person prefix**; or 2) Daisy means to say 'my homework' and correctly produces the person prefix but incorrectly produces a relational verb. This then requires a third-person argument that will likely be obviated in a possessive construction, and so she incorrectly adds the obviative ending to a noun possessed by a first person.

<sup>2</sup> Junker, Marie-Odile. 2003. East Cree Relational Verbs. *International Journal of American Linguistics* 69:3, 307-329.

The fact that Daisy used a relational verb in this context is incorrect. It looks like she hasn't figured out when to use a relational verb. For the purposes of my interest in nominal inflection, I think there is a pattern here: Daisy has generalized the relationship between a relational verb and an obviated noun; in a nutshell

- For comparison, here is a situation leading to an obviative ending on the possessed noun 'homework':
- *utihomeworkim* [ʊ<sup>h</sup>hom'wə-kəm] = 'his/her homework' (00:57:20). Margaret says there is no obviative ending on this one (00:57:32). See the notes below for record 623 for my thoughts. Maybe if it's inanimate, no OBV if coreference, but there will be OBV if animate
- *nikipâtâwân Billy utihomeworkim* [nɪgba'dawan bɪli ʊ<sup>h</sup>hom'wə-kəm] = 'I will bring Billy's homework' (00:56:28). Margaret again says there is no OBV ending on 'his homework'. (00:56:55).
- *Billy chikipâtâwâu utihomeworkimiyiu* [bɪli tʃəgəbatawaʊ(?) ʊ<sup>h</sup>homwə-kəm'jo] 'Billy will bring his (somebody else's homework' (00:58:24). Margaret says there is no final -h on 'his homework' (00:59:37). So here we get the obviative ending finally emerging on 'his homework', but that's because there is disjoint reference

#### Record 422

- Daisy's utterance is *(name) tânitâh âchishtâyich unamemim* [(name) dændəstajtoneməm] ' (name), how do we spell her name?'
- Daisy is not saying an [h] or <yu> at the end of *unamemim* 'her name' (01:01:59).
- *isinihkâsunwin* = 'name' (inanimate noun)
- *tânitâh âchishtâyich utisinihkâsunwin* ['dænda ətʃ'tajtʃ ʊtsən'kæsawn] 'How do we spell her name?' (01:02:38). I possibly misspelled *utisinihkâsunwin*. No obviative at the end of 'her name', but perhaps that's because of coreference and the OBV is instead marked on the verb.

#### Record 623

- Daisy's utterance is < âi mikw anitâh âhîshinâkuniyich (name) âi unituhkuyinim purple > [ajɪm mug ənda nɪʃəgənɪdʒu bægu aj ogwɪnə pəpo] 'Hey, only (name)'s medication is purple'
- Daisy is not pronouncing an obviative ending ([h] or [jo]) on 'his medication' (01:05:53). Again, maybe this has to do with coreference, and Margaret does not produce an OBV on this word either. Margaret says a final -h would be appropriate for the plural marking (01:06:12), and that's because 'medicine' is inanimate.
- I think perhaps 'his medicine' does not take an obviative ending because of coreference (i.e., the possessor has his own medicine). In other words, the clue that 'his medication' is actually obviative is indicated on the verb. This phenomenon is also noted in Junker and Blacksmith (2001)<sup>3</sup>. This could indicate that Daisy understands the grammatical dynamics between coreference and obviation.

---

<sup>3</sup> Junker, Marie-Odile, and Louise Blacksmith. 2001. Obviation, coreference and relational verb forms in East Cree. Papers of the 32nd Algonquian Conference, 258-268.

- *ninituhkuyinim* [nɛntʰ'kwinəm] ‘my medication’ (01:06:19). Not sure I transcribed the <kuyi> sequence properly.
- *ninituhkuyinimh* [nɛntʰ'kwi'nəmʰ] ‘my medications’ (01:07:05). PL -h here.
- *unituhkuyinim* [ɔntʰ'kwinəm] ‘his (own) medication’ (01:07:15).
- *unituhkuyinimh* [ɔntʰ'kwinəmʰ] ‘his (own) medications’ (01:07:35)
- *âh îshinâkuniyichh unituhkuyinimh (name) purple* ‘(Name)’s medications are purple’ (01:09:27). The -h shows up here, but it’s the inanimate proximate plural marker, which is **homophonous** with the inanimate plural obviative. So the key to seeing that Daisy understands the requirement that ‘his medicines’ not receive an obviative suffix because of coreference can only be demonstrated with a singular form for ‘medicine’.

## Record 822

- *nikâwî* [ni'gawi] = ‘my mother’ (01:11:53)
- *ukâwîh* [uka'wiʰ] = ‘her mom’, with OBV -h (01:11:59)

## Record 825

- Daisy’s utterance: *mâuchîh âhtishich nûhkumich* [mædijætʃɪpsləkuntʃ] ‘This is how many grandmas I have’ (lit. ‘There are this many my grandmas’)
- *nûhkumich* [no'kumtʃ] = ‘my grandmothers’ (01:13:25)
- *ûhkumh* [o'kumʰ] = ‘her grandmothers’ (takes the animate obviative ending) (01:13:33)
- *\*ûhkumich* = \*‘her grandmothers’. Just to show that it needs the OBV marker rather than just the animate PL

## Record 831

- The adult’s utterance is <ushchîshikuhch â> ‘on his/her eye?’
- *ushchîshikuhch* [ʊ'ʃtʃɪptʃ] = ‘on her eye’ (01:14:56). I hear a clear [p] in Margaret’s pronunciation. Somebody should double-check.
- *ushchîshikuhch* ‘on her eyes’. Same pronunciation. Shows that the LOC suffix precludes any other suffix, like a plural or obviative. (01:15:19).

## Record 911

- Daisy’s utterance is <ukuhtishkui> [ʊgʊtʃgwi] ‘her throat’
- Adult target: *ukuhtishkui* [ʊ'gʊtʃgwi] = ‘her throat’. Margaret says Daisy does not pronounce an obviative ending here. Perhaps this is because coreference is implied by preceding records? (01:17:16)
- *nikuhtishkui* [nɛ'gʊtʃgwi] = ‘my throat’ (01:17:25)
- *ukuhtishkuiwâuh* [ʊgʊtʃgwi'waʊwʰ] = ‘their throats’ (01:17:40). The final <h> here is the plural for ‘throats’, and the <wâuh> is for plural possessor ‘their’.

## Record 1111

- Daisy’s utterance is <usockim nânitiu âukw wâhchimâtut> [wətsagəm nandə awg ʌʃəmændɪk] ‘It’s her sock, and that’s why she’s crying.’
- *upiywâshikin* [ubi'jəʃəɡɪn] = ‘her sock’ (01:19:43). Again, no obviative ending because of coreference? No obviative ending on *usockim*, either. Same reason?
- *upiywâshikinh* [ubijəʃə'ɡɪnʰ] ‘her socks’ (01:20:27)

- Margaret says a better way to say this record is: <usockim nânitiu âyuwikw wâhchi mâtut> (01:21:12)

### Record 1241

- Daisy's utterance is <uwâpuyânim> 'her blanket'
- Very good example of Daisy overgeneralizing the possessive suffix *-im*
- Correct way to say 'her blanket': *uwâpuyân* [ʊ'wabijan] (01:23:58). No possessive suffix and no obviative here—again, coreference?
- *uwâpuyânh* [ʊwabi'jan<sup>h</sup>] = 'her blankets' (01:24:21)

### Record 1344

- Daisy's utterance is <âi châkiniwâyihtimut niphoneimiyuh> [ajaj dʒəgɪg dʒəgəmaʃtunt nɪfɒnɪmɪjo] 'Hey, take care of my phone' (I think the [dʒəgɪg] is a false start)
- Margaret says the correct adult target for 'my phone' lacks the final <h>: *niphoneimiyiu*. Margaret says the error is that Daisy said it with a final *-h*, because that indicates a plural meaning (01:25:50).
- This record is interesting because we again see an obviative suffix on a noun possessed by a first person ... and there is again a verb with a relational affix. Again, I think the production of *-yiu* is likely a child error, despite the fact that it didn't seem to bother Margaret.
- In the following examples, without relational morphology, Margaret does not produce the OBV suffix:
- *niphoneim* [nə'fɒnəm] = 'my phone' (01:26:30).
- *chiwâpihtân niphoneim* [tʃə'wapdan nə'fɒnəm] 'I saw my phone' (01:26:44).
- *uphoneim* [u'fɒnəm] 'his phone' (01:27:21). No obviative ending.
- *nichîhwâpihtimwân uphoneim* [ntʃə'wahpdəman ʊ'fɒnəm] 'I saw his phone' (01:27:32).
- *châkiniwâyihtimut uphoneim* [tʃɪgə'nɔɪtəmt ʊ'fɒnəm] = 'Take care of his phone' (01:29:12) The final [t] in *châkiniwâyihtimut* really sounds like it becomes part of the onset of *uphoneim*. It looks to me, though, like Margaret produced relational morphology on the verb, but this did not condition the production of *-yiu* on *uphoneim*. I think that was a child error.
- *châkiniwâyihtimin niphoneim* [tʃɪgə'nɔɪtəmən nə'fɒnəm] 'Take care of my phone' (01:29:49). Here Margaret did not produce a version with relational morphology. And there is no *-yiu* that appears on 'my phone'

### Record 1351

- Daisy's utterance is *uutâpânâskumh uyâh wîhkuch â* [modapmæskom ija mikoz æ] 'Let's pretend this is his vehicle, OK?'
  - This is a good example of an equational construction with a demonstrative *uyâh*
  - Margaret says Daisy correctly produces the obviative *-h* ending on 'his vehicle' (01:33:09), but she overgeneralizes the *-im*. The adult-like target is without *-im*: *uutâpânâskwh* [odabə'naskw<sup>h</sup>] 'his vehicle' (01:32:16)
-



## Session 06-Daisy-04\_00\_28

### Record 794 (formerly 795)

- Daisy's utterance is <nichiskutimâchâsim wash> [əntsgotmadæʃim æʃ] 'My teacher is ...'
  - *nichiskutimâchâsim* [ɲskot'mædʒasim] = 'my teacher' (01:35:24)
  - *nichiskutimâchâsimich* [ɲskotmædʒa'simətʃ] = 'my teachers' (01:36:28)
  - *uchiskutimâchâsimh* [ʊtskotmædʒa'sim<sup>h</sup>] = 'his teacher', with final -h (01:35:47). Here 'his teacher' is obviated because it's animate.
  - *uchiskutimâchâsimh* [ʊtskotmædʒa'sim<sup>h</sup>] = 'his teachers', with final h (01:36:23). Here, the final -h is again the animate obviative
- 

## Session 07-Daisy-04\_01\_20

### Record 1011

- Daisy's utterance is <nikipâchichiskutimâkuyiuh nnn uhkumh> [ʊngəbədʒʊdskud mægwejo (name) ʊkʊm<sup>h</sup>] '(name)'s grandma will be teaching me'
  - Margaret hears Daisy pronounce the final -h on the verb (01:37:45)
  - The word *uhkumh* 'her grandmother' gets obviated, because it's animate. Margaret hears Daisy produce it (01:38:31)
  - This is a sophisticated obviative construction from Daisy: She uses the proper INV morphology on the verb, because an obviated entity is acting upon her
- 

## Session 11-Daisy-04\_04\_04

### Record 101

- Daisy's utterance is *nichîhutininimâkw âi nichîhmiyikw nûhtâwî uchishkwâshishîmh* [əndʒʊdənmaʔənajəndʒimigɪtsməɣɪʔmətawe:wəʃhʌʃi] 'She bought them for me, my father's girlfriend gave them to me.'
- Margaret says that Daisy's utterance has some errors, because she omitted OBV endings from both verbs. Here is the adult-like target, in NEC orthography:  
*nichîhutininimâkuyiuh âi nichîhmiyikuyiuh nûhtâwî uchishkwâshishîmh* [ndʒi<sup>h</sup>ʊtinmagwijojəndʒimigwijojənotawe<sup>w</sup> ʊtʃwəʃim<sup>h</sup>] (01:40:18)
- *nûhtâwî uchishkwâshishîmh* [no'tawi ʊtʃgəʃim<sup>h</sup>] = 'my father's girlfriend' (01:39:58)
- Margaret says Daisy correctly produces the OBV -h ending on *uchishkwâshishîmh* 'his girlfriend'. I don't hear it, but I'll defer to Margaret.
- So Daisy produced obviation correctly on the noun but not on the verbs (01:42:34)

### Record 161

- Margaret notes that Daisy is taking on some characteristics of her parent's dialect, which is spoken in a community to the north (01:43:14)
- Daisy's utterance is *âkuh âkuh uyâh kânipâyichh utiwâshishîmh* [k<sup>h</sup>u :kʊ :jæ kanbajʃwɔdəwɛʃ:ɪb<sup>h</sup>] 'So this is her baby that is sleeping'
- Adult target: [ak<sup>h</sup> ʊk<sup>h</sup> uja gənəbajəbtʃ<sup>h</sup> utəwəʃ:im<sup>h</sup>] (01:43:53)

- *utiwâshishîmh* [otəwa'ʃim<sup>h</sup>] = 'her baby' (01:44:32)
- Margaret says Daisy correctly produced the final OBV *-h* on 'her baby' (01:44:28)
- This is a sophisticated obviative construction from Daisy: The subject of the sentence 'her baby' is necessarily obviated, and she produces the correct ending on the verb, and she correctly produces an obviated DEM to agree with 'her baby'
- This is also a discontinuous noun phrase: *uyâh kânipâyichh utiwâshishîmh* (lit. 'This who is sleeping her baby'). Moving the verb in front of the demonstrative produces the same translation: *âkuh âkuh kânipâyichh uyâh utiwâshishîmh* (01:45:23)

### Record 162

- Daisy's utterance is *âkuh uyâh ukâwih âkuh uyâh kâwîhpâmât* [k<sup>h</sup>o ija ugawi k<sup>h</sup>o ija gawibamat] 'So this is her mother and she (the baby) slept with this one'
- Margaret hears Daisy correctly produce the obviative *-h* on *ukâwih* 'her mother' (01:46:50)
- The second demonstrative *uyâh* does not coreference 'her mother'. The baby is sleeping with a different person, not her mother. (01:47:05).
- This is really interesting because 'her baby' is already obviated from the preceding record, and then 'her mother' is obviated in this record. And then another obviative form *uyâh* is used to refer to yet another person. Seems like an opportunity for further obviative marking, to refer to the person the baby is sleeping with? But perhaps this is no further obviative marking for DEMs?

## Session 15-Daisy-04\_06\_27

### Record 1065 (formerly 1064)

- Orthography is OK, but Daisy's using a plural form to refer to the child of (name) + somebody else. Daisy's utterance is *âi kiyipwâ (name) utiwâshishîmiwâuh* 'a... it's (name)'s child'
- Daisy's making an interesting error: She produces the plural possessor suffix *-iwâu* on 'child' but she only produces the name of one of the possessors. She needed to say both names to make it grammatical. In other words, she's mistakenly saying 'their child', not 'her child'.
- *utiwâshishîmiwâuh* [ud<sup>w</sup>əʃim'wau<sup>h</sup>] = 'their child' (01:50:23)